REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the April 14, 2011 Final Office action and have amended the claims. Specifically, this Amendment F reverts claims 1, 3, 5–8, 10–16, 19–22, and 24–26 back to the form discussed with the Examiner on November 4, 2010 and December 16, 2010. The Examiner agreed that claims 1, 3, 5–8, 10–16, 19–22, and 24–26 as amended herein were allowable over the previously applied references (Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693), Leong (U.S. Patent No. 5,513,342), Southgate (U.S. Patent No. 5,561,757), Tilt (U.S. Patent No. 5,363,481), Nielsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,437,758), and Carpenter (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,997)). In particular, the Examiner agreed that the applied references failed to disclose an automatic mode and a manual mode in which resizing one of the tiles during the manual mode does not cause the other tiles to be resized.

This Amendment F amends claims 1, 10, 27, 33, and 41 and cancels claims 29 and 30. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3–5, 8, 9, 12, 14–16, and 19-23

Claims 1, 3–5, 8, 9, 12, 14–16, and 19–23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Leong, and further in view of Southgate. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

As noted above, the Examiner previously agreed that the independent claims, as amended above, distinguish over the applied references. Applicants therefore submit that amended independent claim 1, independent claim 8, independent claim 15, independent claim 20, and their respective dependent claims are allowable over the applied references.

Claims 27–31, 33, 34, 38-41, 42, and 46

Claims 27-31, 33, 34, 38-41, 42, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2009/0132942 (hereinafter "Santoro"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element of the claims.

Amended independent claim 27 is directed to a method for sizing a tile displaying content on a display. As amended, claim 27 incorporates the subject matter of now-canceled dependent claims 29 and 30 and recites, among other things, "providing the tile within a sidebar on the display, said sidebar having a defined size on the display, said tile displaying first content," **"automatically resizing the tile** within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar based at least in part on changes in the first content." Moreover, claim 27 specifies that "a user is able to **manually resize the tile**" and "when the user manually resizes the tile a manual mode is entered, and . . . **during the manual mode the tile may not be automatically resized**". As noted above, the Examiner agreed that the previously applied references (Hansen, Leong, and Tilt) failed to disclose these elements of the claim.

Santoro fails to cure these deficiencies, as the Office instead cites Santoro as purportedly disclosing automatically resizing a tile within a sidebar without resizing the sidebar based at least in part on changes in the first content. Contrary to the Office's assertion, Santoro does not even disclose these elements. Santoro instead describes a system that permits a user to specify a number of tiles on a grid. (*See* Santoro, [0102]). For example, the user may specify seven tiles and since seven does not neatly partition into a square/rectangular array, the system in Santoro "understands that particular applications benefit from being displayed in tiles that are greater than the unit tile size, and therefore automatically assigns such application to larger files without the user's intervention." (*Id.*). Inasmuch as Santoro discloses initially assigning applications to different sized tiles on a grid, Santoro fails to disclose assigning an application to the tile and **subsequently resizing the assigned tile based on changes in how the application is displayed**. Santoro therefore fail to disclose automatic resizing as recited in amended claim 27. And since the manual resizing recited in claim 27 interrelates with the automatic resizing, i.e., "wherein during the manual mode the tile may not be automatically resized", Santoro fails to disclose these elements as well. As such, the combination of applied references fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 27.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 27 and its dependent claims 28 and 31 are allowable over the applied references for at least the reasons given above.

Amended independent claim 33 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for sizing a tile. Applicants submit that independent claim 33 is allowable over the applied references for at least the same essential reasons given above for the allowance of amended independent claim 27. For example, claim 33 recites, among other things, "a tile component for **providing the tile within the sidebar** having the defined size, said **tile displaying first content**" and "an automatic resizing component for automatically resizing the tile within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar **based at least in part on changes in the first content**". As noted above, the combination of Hansen, Leong, Tilt, and Santoro fail to disclose automatic resizing based, in part, on change in the first content. The combination of applied references therefore fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 33.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 33 and its dependent claims 34, 38, and 39 are allowable over the applied references for at least the reasons given above.

Amended independent claim 41 is directed to a system for resizing a tile on a computer display. Applicants submit that independent claim 41 is allowable over the applied references for at least the same essential reasons given above for the allowance of amended independent claims 27 and 33. For example, amended claim 41 recites, among other things, "a first routine for **providing the tile** within the sidebar, said **tile displaying first content**" and "a second routine for tracking an amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been most recently resized and for automatically resizing the tile within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar **based at least in part on changes in the first content**". As noted above, the combination of Hansen, Leong, Tilt, and Santoro fail to disclose automatic resizing based, in part, on change in the first content. The combination of applied references therefore fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 41.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 41 and its dependent claims 42 and 46 are allowable over the applied references for at least the reasons given above.

Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, and 24-26

Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Southgate, and further in view of Nielsen. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

Dependent claims 6 and 7, 10 and 11, and 24-26 depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 20, respectively. As noted above, the Examiner agreed that the combination of previously applied references failed to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 8, and 20, such as the automatic resizing and the manual resizing recited in the claims. Applicants submit that dependent claims 6, 7, 10,11, and 24-26 are allowable for at least the same essential reasons given for the allowance of their respective independent claims.

Claims 32, 37, and 43–45

Claims 32, 37, and 43–45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt, Santoro, and Nielsen. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element of these claims.

Claims 32, 37, and 43-45 depend from amended independent claims 27, 33, and 41 respectively. As noted above, the Examiner agreed that the combination of previously applied references failed to disclose each and every element of independent claims 27, 33, and 41, such as the automatic resizing and the manual resizing recited in the claims. Santoro fails to cure these deficiencies, as Santoro does not disclose automatic resizing based on a change in the tile content, but instead merely initially assigns applications to differently sized tiles. Since Santoro does not disclose the recited automatic resizing, Santoro cannot disclose any manual resizing that is interrelated with the automatic resizing. Applicants submit that dependent claims 32, 37, and 43–45 are allowable for at least the same essential reasons given above for the allowance of independent claims 27, 33, and 41.

Claim 40

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt and Santoro, and in further view of Southgate. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element of the claim. Applicants submit that dependent claim 40 is allowable for at least the same essential reasons given above for the allowance of amended independent claim 33, from which claim 40 depends.

Claim 13

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Leong, and in further view of Carpenter. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element of the claim. Applicants submit that dependent claim 13 is allowable for at least the same essential reasons given above for the allowance of independent claim 8, from which claim 13 depends.

Claims 35 and 36

Claims 35 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt and Santoro, and in further view of Carpenter. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element of these claims. Applicants submit that dependent claims 35 and 36 are allowable for at least the same essential reasons given above for the allowance of amended independent claim 33, from which claims 35 and 36 depend.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 5–8, 10–16, 19–22, 24–28, and 31–46 are allowable for at least the reasons given above and, as such, the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Although the art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the claims. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam L. Bagwell/

Adam L. Bagwell, Reg. No. 67,043
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 345-7000

RMB/ALB/lav